

## REMARKS

Claims 1-16 are pending in this Application, with claims 7-14 and 16 having been previously withdrawn. Claims 1-6 and 15 are amended above.

### Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph

Claims 1-6 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph for being allegedly indefinite. Referring first to “moveably arranges with said carriage,” Applicant respectfully directs the Examiner to page 2, paragraph 7, third sentence of Applicant’s Specification, which describes the transport device to be carried by a rack that is moveable relative to the carriage, facilitating a coupling a the transport device relative to the carriage after the transport device approaches the matching module. Moreover, this term is referred to at pages 11 and 12 of the Specification, so as to describe the embodiment of Figure 5.

Referring first to “moveably arranges with said carriage,” Applicant respectfully directs the Examiner to page 2, paragraph 7, second sentence of Applicant’s Specification, which describes the matching module to be a heat treatment chamber. Moreover, regarding the embodiment related to Figure 5, other chambers (such as 50, 50a...50c) can form matching modules. Further explanation can be found at page 8, paragraph 33, and the description related to Figure 5.

Applicant respectfully amends the claims to address the other 112 specific 112 issues.

### Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over United States Patent No. 6,749,800 to Muller-Ziller (“Muller-Ziller” hereinafter) in view of United States Patent No. 4,746,258 to Loomer (“Loomer” hereinafter). Applicant respectfully traverses.

For an obviousness rejection to be proper, the Examiner must meet the burden of establishing that all elements of the invention are disclosed in the prior art and that the prior art relied upon, coupled with knowledge generally available in the art at the time of the invention, must contain some suggestion or incentive that would have motivated the skilled artisan to

modify a reference or combined references. *In re Fine*, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988); *In Re Wilson*, 165 U.S.P.Q. 494, 496 (C.C.P.A. 1970); *Amgen v. Chugai Pharmaceuticals Co.*, 927 U.S.P.Q.2d, 1016, 1023 (Fed. Cir. 1996).

Applicant's amended claim 1 recites *inter alia*,

“a clamping device for forming a vacuum-tight seal when connected with a corresponding clamping device on a matching module, wherein said clamping device is arranged at said transport device.”

Neither Muller-Ziller nor Loomer, taken separately or in combination, teach a clamping device at a transport device *and* a corresponding clamping device on a matching module, wherein the clamping device and corresponding clamping device form a vacuum tight seal when connected. Instead, referring to column 6, lines 22-28 of Muller-Ziller, the connecting device is only taught to be connected to a transfer canal 60 (not a “corresponding clamp”). As Loomer does not teach a clamping device at all, Loomer does not remedy the deficiencies of Muller-Ziller.

Accordingly, any proposed combination of Muller-Ziller and Loomer does not teach every element of Applicant's claim 1. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that *prima facie* obviousness does not exist regarding claim 1 with respect to the proposed combination of Muller-Ziller and Loomer. Since the proposed combination of Muller-Ziller and Loomer fails to teach or suggest all of the limitations of claim 1, clearly, one of ordinary skill at the time of Applicant's invention would not have a motivation to modify or combine the references, or a reasonable likelihood of success in forming the claimed invention by modifying or combining. Thus, here again, *prima facie* obviousness does not exist. *Id.*

Claims 2-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Muller-Ziller in view of Loomer, in view of United States Patent No. 4,461,455 to Mills (“Mills” hereinafter). Applicant respectfully traverses.

Applicant respectfully points out that claims 2-3 depend from Applicant's amended claim 1. Accordingly, any proposed combination of Muller-Ziller and Loomer does not teach every element of Applicant's claims 2 and 3. As Mills does not remedy the deficiencies of Muller-Ziller and Loomer, any proposed combination of Muller-Ziller, Loomer, and Mills also does not teach every element of Applicant's claims 2 and 3. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that *prima facie* obviousness does not exist regarding claims 2 and 3 with respect to the proposed combination of Muller-Ziller, Loomer, and Mills. Since the proposed combination of Muller-Ziller, Loomer, and Mills fails to teach or suggest all of the limitations of claims 2 and 3, clearly, one of ordinary skill at the time of Applicant's invention would not have a motivation to modify or combine the references, or a reasonable likelihood of success in forming the claimed invention by modifying or combining. Thus, here again, *prima facie* obviousness does not exist. *Id.*

Claims 4-6 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Muller-Ziller in view of Loomer, in view of Mills in further view of United States Patent No. 5,271,678 to Bourgeot ("Bourgeot" hereinafter) or United States Patent No. 6,235,400 to Natsubori ("Natsubori" hereinafter). Applicant respectfully traverses.

Applicant respectfully points out that claims 4-6 and 15 depend from Applicant's amended claim 1. Accordingly, any proposed combination of Muller-Ziller and Loomer does not teach every element of Applicant's claims 4-6 and 15. As none of Mills, Bourgeot, and Natsubori remedy the deficiencies of Muller-Ziller and Loomer, any proposed combination of Muller-Ziller, Loomer, Mills, Bourgeot, and Natsubori also does not teach every element of Applicant's claims 4-6 and 15. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that *prima facie* obviousness does not exist regarding claims 4-6 and 15 with respect to the proposed combination of Muller-Ziller, Loomer, Mills, Bourgeot, and Natsubori. Since the proposed combination of Muller-Ziller, Loomer, Mills, Bourgeot, and Natsubori fails to teach or suggest all of the limitations of claims 2 and 3, clearly, one of ordinary skill at the time of Applicant's invention would not have a motivation to modify or combine the references, or a reasonable likelihood of success in forming the claimed invention by modifying or combining. Thus, here again, *prima*

*facie* obviousness does not exist. *Id.*

All rejections and objections are addressed above. Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's attorney at the below-listed phone number regarding this Response or otherwise concerning the present application.

Applicant hereby petitions for any necessary extension of time required under 37 C.F.R. §§1.136(a) or 1.136(b) which may be required for entry and consideration of the present Reply.

If there are any charges due with respect to this Amendment or otherwise, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 06-1130 maintained by Applicant's attorneys.

Respectfully submitted,  
CANTOR COLBURN LLP

By: /Daniel R. Gibson/  
Daniel R. Gibson  
Registration No. 56,539  
CANTOR COLBURN LLP  
55 Griffin Road South  
Bloomfield, CT 06002  
Telephone: 860-286-2929  
Facsimile: 860-286-0115  
Customer No. 23413

Date: December 20, 2007